

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is requiring restriction to one of the following groups:

Group I, Claims 1-10, and 13-15, drawn to a wallcovering assembly, and

Group II, Claims 16-25, drawn to a process of making a wallcovering assembly.

Applicants provisionally elect Group I, Claims 1-10, and 13-15, drawn to a wallcovering assembly, with traverse on the grounds that no adequate reasons and/or examples have been provided to support a conclusion of patentable distinctiveness between the identified groups. Also, it has not been shown that a burden exists in searching the claims of the two groups.

Moreover, the M.P.E.P. at §803 states as follows:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without a serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on its merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Applicants respectfully submit that a search of all of the claims would not impose a serious burden.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that, should the claims of Group I be found allowable, the Office should expand its search to the claims of Group II.


Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement.

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
Norman F. Oblon

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James H. Knebel  
Registration No. 22,630

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/09)